

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make two suggestions to the House. Since there appears to be general agreement to accept an amendment, which the government would be prepared to move at the committee stage, to reduce the period of time in which the comptroller would be operative, say to the end of the fiscal year, and since there also appears to be general agreement that the bill ought to be passed quickly, perhaps the House would agree to continue to sit past ten o'clock for the purpose of allowing hon. members who want to speak on second reading to do so, and then possibly we could deal with the amendments. In this way we could continue to make progress and have the bill enacted speedily.

Mr. Baldwin: Do I understand the minister to say there would be an acceptance of the principle that the date of the operative part of the bill would be limited to March 31, and in addition that there should be an arrangement by which, with unanimous consent, the bill would be referred to the Committee of the Whole, and that hopefully we would give it second reading tonight and then proceed in committee tomorrow?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Further than that, I would be prepared to move an amendment terminating the appointment at March 31 next.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is this agreed?

Mr. Peters: No.

● (10:00 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I gather that there has been some misunderstanding with regard to the disposition of the proceedings mentioned a moment ago. I believe that there is a disposition at this point to give the bill second reading, after which we will proceed with the Committee of the Whole stage tomorrow.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, that is on the basis of the undertaking the government House leader gave previously.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I gave an undertaking and am prepared to stand by it.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask what is to happen to our

amendment? Could the government House leader indicate what we are to do with the amendment to the main motion?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the amendment was introduced by the hon. member's colleague and I gather it is to be withdrawn. Is that not understood?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. That was not the suggestion, and that is what worried me just now.

Mr. Stanbury: Why not deal with it in committee?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. It seems that I misunderstood; I thought there was agreement on the point. Perhaps we had better continue with the late show.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—HAWKESBURY—GRANT TO DUPLATE OF CANADA—LOSS OF JOBS BY OSHAWA EMPLOYEES.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I asked the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) to account for the decision which resulted in the loss, in the fall of this year, of several hundred jobs in Oshawa. At that time the question was ruled out of order. I am now raising this matter because it is important not only to our entire community but to the entire regional economic development program this government has undertaken.

What are the facts? The company directly involved in the matter is Duplate of Canada Limited. The company, as is frequently the case, is misleadingly named. Duplate of Canada is owned in great part by the Pittsburgh Glass Company which controls some 66 per cent of the shares, and Pilkington Glass Limited, a subsidiary of Pilkington Brothers of England, which owns the remaining shares. These two foreign corporations happen to be the two major glass manufacturing concerns in the world. The Canadian company can